

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Nathaniel Flack	Team: Squad #5	CCRB Case #: 201707341	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 08/31/2017 5:30 PM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 24	18 Mo. SOL 2/28/2019	EO SOL 2/28/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 09/01/2017 7:30 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 09/07/2017 12:15 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Witness(es)	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Rafael Aquino	28432	952417	PSA 6
2. POM Erick Clarck	13492	952593	PSA 6

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Erick Clarck	Abuse: On August 31, 2017, Police Officer Erick Clarck damaged § 87(2)(b)'s property.	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Rafael Aquino	Abuse: On August 31, 2017, Police Officer Rafael Aquino damaged § 87(2)(b)'s property.	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM Erick Clarck	Abuse: On an unknown date, Police Officer Erick Clarck questioned § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

§ 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with IAB via telephone on September 1, 2017, on behalf of her son § 87(2)(b) and her boyfriend § 87(2)(b). Despite extensive efforts to obtain a sworn statement from § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) they were ultimately uncooperative. § 87(2)(b) was called on September 11, 2017, and asked the investigator to contact her the following day, September 12, 2017, to schedule an appointment after she could consult with her employer and family members. The undersigned called § 87(2)(b) at the prearranged time the following day, but she did not answer, and the undersigned left a message. On the same day, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) and scheduled him for an appointment on September 18, 2017. During this call, § 87(2)(b) gave the phone to a witness named § 87(2)(b) who was scheduled for an interview for the following day, September 13, 2017. On the same day (September 12, 2017), the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) who said he would discuss scheduling an appointment with § 87(2)(b) and asked to be called later the same week. § 87(2)(b) missed her appointment on September 13, 2017 and did not previously contact the investigator to cancel or reschedule. § 87(2)(b) did not respond to five subsequent calls with voicemails between September 13, 2017 and October 3, 2017. On September 14, 2017, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) and left voice messages to confirm § 87(2)(b) appointment. On September 18, 2017, § 87(2)(b) missed his interview without previously canceling or rescheduling. The undersigned called § 87(2)(b) later the same day, and he stated that he did not appear for the interview because his mother said she would prefer that he not go, though § 87(2)(b) added that § 87(2)(b) might still be interested in scheduling an interview. The undersigned called § 87(2)(b) the same day and left a message. On September 19, 2017, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) who asked to be called back later the same day because he was at work. The undersigned called § 87(2)(b) the same day at the prearranged time, and left a message. The undersigned called § 87(2)(b) on September 20, 2017 and left voice message, and sent please call letters to her and § 87(2)(b) on the same day.

On September 21, 2017, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) who scheduled an appointment for himself the following day, and said that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) would be coming with him. The same day, the undersigned sent § 87(2)(b) an appointment confirmation text message from Investigator Alfredo Gonzalez's agency cell phone, asking that § 87(2)(b) contact the undersigned in advance if he needed to cancel or reschedule the appointment. The following day, prior to the interview time, the undersigned called § 87(2)(b) to inquire whether she would be appearing at the CCRB, but the call was immediately disconnected. The investigator called back directly afterwards and left a message. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) appeared at the CCRB on September 22, 2017, and the investigator was not contacted previously to cancel or reschedule the interview. The undersigned sent please call letters to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) the same day. The investigator called § 87(2)(b) on September 25, 2017, and he stated that he missed his appointment because he was arrested, and said that he would speak with § 87(2)(b) and contact the investigator later the same day regarding how he wanted to move forward. § 87(2)(b) did not contact the investigator later that day. Also on September 25, 2017, the investigator obtained multiple angles of exterior video footage from the NYCHA complex where the incident occurred, which upon review did not show the incident. On September 26, 2017, the investigator called § 87(2)(b). He asked not to be called any more, and said that § 87(2)(b) should be contacted going forward to schedule an appointment. The undersigned placed

five calls with voice messages and sent two please call letters to § 87(2)(b) between September 26, 2017 and October 10, 2017. § 87(2)(b) did not respond to any of the above contact attempts, and none of the letters were returned as undeliverable. A Department of Correction search conducted on October 11, 2017 indicated that neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) was incarcerated in New York. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

Squad: 5

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Squad Leader: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer: _____
Title/Signature Print Date